

From: [William Brooks](#)
To: Scoping_Delta_Plan@Delta_Council
Subject: Clarification of Oral Comment I versed at the Stockton, Jan 25th meeting.
Date: Monday, January 31, 2011 2:58:25 PM

Hello Terry,

Please note that this was a clarification of the Oral comment I spoke out on at the January 25th Meeting in Stockton. I was the last but one speaker (with an accent),

Thanks
William Brooks

~~~~~  
Scoping Comments: Draft EIR for the Delta Plan (Dated Dec 10, 2010):

**On Page 12, on the map. I think that the Secondary Planning Area should be split into a Third area.**

I don't think an accurate EIR could be achieved without separating out everything that is on the non Central Valley side of the Tehachapi Mountain range.

This being for the following reason:

Page 23, lines 28, and 30 both specify that: 'Effects these plans have on regional and statewide budgets, as well as statewide economic vitality, must be considered.'

This ties in with Page 25, line 3, & 15: 'Air Quality considerations, and Carbon sequestrations and greenhouse gas emissions-climate change' considerations.

I received a Staff Report from the California Energy Commission, which details the huge amount of energy currently expended by California on pumping and treating water, and how the **biggest single energy** user is the current State Water Project. This is 'due to the fact that it moves large quantities of water over great distances and over steep terrain'. 'The largest of these pumping efforts is the 3000 foot lift of water to get it over the Tehachapi's for delivery to Southern California'. 'This is currently over 2,200 kWh per acre foot of water pumped'.

The new plans for the water conveyance system involve 5 large pumps in the Clarksburg area. Specs I have seen indicate that together they are capable of **actually draining the river in the summer time**. If the current, small by comparison, system uses this much energy what are the costs associated with the planned system?

For this reason, I think that it is important that there be a section in the EIR, with data supported by both the **California Energy Commission**, and the **Air Resource Board**, that encompasses the Department of Water Resources predicted "Net short energy" costs and all the costs of the new energy requirements for this project, this should include the costs on new power plants, the associated air pollution costs and all the costs associated with the importation of fossil fuels to feed these plants.

Plus a factor that includes the predicted massive increase in Energy Costs in the future.

**If all of these are not considered, I would say that your Environmental Impact Report is flawed.**

I think that when California Tax payers realize the full costs of this venture they would rather choose to spend this money on water conservation, efficiency, storm water capture, grey water landscaping, low flow fixtures, water assessment help and the subsequent jobs this could create, as well as the many other sustainable options currently available. We need a sustainable solution for California's water problems and not more taxes to bring down our local economy.

Thank you for considering this.

Sincerely,  
William Brooks, 3241 Becerra Way, Sacramento, CA 95821